

REMARKS

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-29 are pending in the application. Claims 1-29 stand rejected. Claims 30-37 have been withdrawn.

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson et al (hereinafter Larson, US 5,825,854) in view of Prust (US 6,714,968 B1).

The examiner is respectfully urged to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the following remarks and to allow all of the claims. The Examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney directly at 206.903.2467 to discuss any issues that may occur to the Examiner after reviewing the instant response.

A. Applicant's Claimed Techniques

Applicant's independent claim 1 is directed to "a system for management and manipulation of stored files through electronic mail items." Claim 1 recites that the system comprises, among other things, "a file handle recognizer configured to locate a file handle pattern within the electronic mail item."

B. The Prior Art

The Larson reference discloses telephonic based access to applications ("tapplets") that are able to execute commands on a remote system. By accessing a tapplet, the user can communicate with one of the applications within the computer through the telephone handset. A tapplet may provide a link to a file manager, wherein the user can access a file within the computer. (Larson, col. 5, lines 25-38).

The Prust reference discloses access to a remote server utilizing multiple interfaces executing on the remote server. (Prust, col. 1, lines 31-33).

C. Claims 1-29 are Patentable over Larson in View of Prust

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection over Larson in view of Prust should be withdrawn, since the combination of Larson and Prust fails to disclose the "file handle recognizer configured to locate a file handle pattern within the electronic mail item" of claim 1. This claim recitation appears to be wholly missing from both Larson's and Prust's disclosure.

DOCKET NO.: **13-0006
Application No.: 09/915,425
Office Action Dated: July 12, 2007

PATENT

At lines 25-38, Larson discloses, in part, “another tapplet may provide a link to a file manager, wherein the user can access a file within the computer.” This is not a file handle recognizer as claimed by applicant. A “file handle recognizer” recognizes the existence of a file handle within a field. The Larson reference, on the other hand, discloses nothing that recognizes the existence of a file, but rather, a link to a file manager application, without a specific file handle, much less a file handle recognizer. Because Larson in view of Prust fails to disclose every element of claim 1, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-17 depend from claim 1. Because claim 1 is in condition for allowance, applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-17 are in condition for allowance.

Similarly to claim 1, Larson in view of Prust fails to disclose “locating the file handle within the electronic mail item” of claims 18, 20 and 25. Because Larson in view of Prust fails to disclose every element of claims 18 and 20, applicant respectfully submits that claims 18 and 20 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 19 depends from claim 18. Because claim 18 is in condition for allowance, applicant respectfully submits that claim 19 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 21-24 depends from claim 20. Because claim 20 is in condition for allowance, applicant respectfully submits that claim 21-24 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 26-29 depends from claim 25. Because claim 25 is in condition for allowance, applicant respectfully submits that claim 26-29 is in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, the examiner is respectfully urged to reconsider the application and to withdraw the rejections.

Date: November 5, 2007

/Peter Trahms-Neudorfer/
Peter Trahms-Neudorfer
Registration No. 59,282

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439